

# 2018 Current Fiscal Year Report: National Human Genome Research Institute Initial Review Group

Report Run Date: 06/05/2019 11:29:32 AM

## 1. Department or Agency

Department of Health and Human Services

## 2. Fiscal Year

2018

## 3. Committee or Subcommittee

National Human Genome Research Institute Initial Review Group

## 3b. GSA Committee No.

881

## 4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?

No

## 5. Current Charter

07/01/1990

## 6. Expected Renewal Date

## 7. Expected Term Date

## 8a. Was Terminated During Fiscal Year?

No

## 8b. Specific Termination Authority

## 8c. Actual Term Date

## 9. Agency Recommendation for Next Fiscal Year

Continue

## 10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?

Not Applicable

## 10b. Legislation Pending?

Not Applicable

## 11. Establishment Authority Authorized by Law

## 12. Specific Establishment Authority

42 U.S.C. 282(b)(16)

## 13. Effective Date

11/20/1985

## 14. Committee Type

Continuing

## 14c. Presidential?

No

## 15. Description of Committee Grant Review Committee

## 16a. Total Number of Reports

No Reports for this Fiscal Year

## 17a. Open Meetings and Dates 0 17b. Closed Meetings and Dates 3 17c. Partially Closed Meetings and Dates 0 17d. Total Meetings and Dates 3

### Purpose

NIH Peer Review

### Start

11/02/2017

### End

- 11/03/2017

NIH Peer Review

03/15/2018

- 03/15/2018

NIH Peer Review

06/08/2018

- 06/08/2018

## Number of Committee Meetings Listed: 3

## 18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members

Current FY \$7,400.00 Next FY \$7,400.00

## 18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members

\$0.00 \$0.00

## 18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff

\$137,160.00 \$139,766.00

## 18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants

\$0.00 \$0.00

## 18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members

\$15,537.00 \$15,626.00

## 18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members

\$0.00 \$0.00

## 18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff

\$0.00 \$0.00

<b>18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18c. Other(rents,user charges, graphics, printing, mail, etc.)</b>	\$11,837.00	\$11,955.00
<b>18d. Total</b>	\$171,934.00	\$174,747.00
<b>19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)</b>	1.00	1.00

**20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?**

Section 492 of the PHS Act states that The Secretary...shall by regulation require appropriate technical and scientific peer review of --(A) applications...; and (B) biomedical and behavioral research and development contracts.... This committee is composed entirely of recognized biomedical and/or behavioral research authorities who represent the forefront of research and technical knowledge and who provide first-level merit review of highly scientific and technical research grant applications (and/or contract proposals) in the areas relevant to genomic research including: construction of genetic maps, development of physical maps, determination of DNA sequences, management and analysis of the resulting data, development of innovative technologies required to achieve the above, and development of tools and resources supportive of this effort, as well as in areas relevant to the ethical, legal, and social implication of genomic research. During this reporting period the committee reviewed 37 applications in the amount of \$76,969,737.

**20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?**

The members of this committee are authorities knowledgeable in the fields of biologic informatics, software design of genetic information systems, molecular cytogenetics, human gene mapping, gene transfer, gene therapy, physical mapping, comparative genetics, genetic mapping, population genetics, epidemiology, developmental biology, informatics, sequencing, instrumentation computer analysis, chemistry and cytogenetics, and the ethical, legal, and social implications of human genome research.

**20c. How frequent and relevant are the Committee Meetings?**

The committee held three meetings during this report period.

**20d. Why can't the advice or information this committee provides be obtained elsewhere?**

This committee is composed entirely of recognized biomedical and/or behavioral research authorities who represent the forefront of research and technical knowledge and who provide first-level merit review of highly scientific and technical research grant applications and contract proposals. These evaluations and recommendations cannot be obtained from other sources because the specialized, complex nature of the applications and proposals requires a unique balance and breadth of expertise not available on the NIH staff or from established sources.

## **20e. Why is it necessary to close and/or partially closed committee meetings?**

The meetings of the National Human Genome Research Institute Initial Review Group were closed to the public for the review of grant applications and/or contract proposals. Sections 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act permit the closing of meetings where discussion could reveal confidential trade secrets or commercial property such as patentable material and personal information, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

## **21. Remarks**

Reports: This committee did not produce any public reports during the fiscal year. The DFO and Decision Maker are the same person, the Co-Chief, Scientific Review Branch due to delegations of authority and assignments in this Institute.

## **Designated Federal Officer**

**KEN D. NAKAMURA CO-CHIEF, SCIENTIFIC REVIEW BRANCH**

<b>Committee Members</b>	<b>Start</b>	<b>End</b>	<b>Occupation</b>	<b>Member Designation</b>
AHITUV, NADAV	11/02/2017	11/03/2017	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
BADER, GARY	11/02/2017	11/03/2017	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
BLAKE, JUDITH	08/01/2016	06/30/2020	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
BOEHNKE, MICHAEL	07/01/2017	06/30/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
BRAVO, HECTOR	07/01/2017	06/30/2021	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
CHURCH, GEORGE	11/02/2017	11/03/2017	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
EICHLER, EVAN	08/11/2014	06/30/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
HALL, IRA	08/10/2016	06/30/2020	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
KIM, TAE	07/29/2016	06/30/2020	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
MURRAY, JEFFREY	11/02/2017	11/03/2017	DEPUTY DIRECTOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
NUSBAUM, HARRIS	11/02/2017	11/03/2017	CO-DIRECTOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
PARKER, LISA	11/02/2017	11/03/2017	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
RUAN, YIJUN	11/02/2017	11/03/2017	RESEARCH SCIENTIST	Peer Review Consultant Member
SINSHEIMER, JANET	08/28/2015	06/30/2019	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
STRANGER, BARBARA	11/02/2017	11/03/2017	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF MEDICINE	Peer Review Consultant Member
STUBBS, LISA	08/19/2015	06/30/2019	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member

**Number of Committee Members Listed: 16**

## **Narrative Description**

The goal of NIH research is to acquire new knowledge to help prevent, detect, diagnose, and treat disease and disability, from the rarest genetic disorder to the common cold. The NIH mission is to uncover new knowledge that will lead to better health for everyone. NIH works toward that mission by supporting the research of non-Federal scientists in universities, medical schools, hospitals, and research institutions throughout the country and abroad. Section 492 of the PHS Act states that The Secretary ...shall by regulation require appropriate technical and scientific peer review of -(A) applications...; and (B) biomedical and behavioral research and development contracts...

**What are the most significant program outcomes associated with this committee?**

Checked if Applies

- |   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| Improvements to health or safety                  | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Trust in government                               | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Major policy changes                              | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Advance in scientific research                    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Effective grant making                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Improved service delivery                         | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Increased customer satisfaction                   | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Implementation of laws or regulatory requirements | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Other   | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

**Outcome Comments**

NA

**What are the cost savings associated with this committee?**

Checked if Applies

- |                            |                                     |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| None                       | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Unable to Determine        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Under \$100,000            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| \$100,000 - \$500,000      | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| \$500,001 - \$1,000,000    | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| \$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000  | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| \$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Over \$10,000,000          | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Cost Savings Other         | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

**Cost Savings Comments**

NIH supported basic and clinical research accomplishments often take many years to unfold into new diagnostic tests and new ways to treat and prevent diseases.

**What is the approximate Number of recommendations produced by this committee for the life of the committee?**

462

**Number of Recommendations Comments**

Grant review

**What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Fully implemented by the agency?**

0%

**% of Recommendations Fully Implemented Comments**

NIH Peer Review Committees are involved in the initial review of research grant applications. The NIH dual peer review system is mandated by statute in accordance with section 492 of the Public Health Service Act. The charge to this committee is to determine scientific and technical merit of the individual grants or contracts. These recommendations are forwarded to Federal officials who generally accept the committee's recommendations and favorable applications are then forwarded for the second level of review performed by Institute and Center (IC) National Advisory Councils or Boards. Only applications that are favorably recommended by both the initial peer review committee and the Advisory Council may be recommended for funding.

**What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Partially implemented by the agency?**

0%

**% of Recommendations Partially Implemented Comments**

NIH Peer Review Committees are involved in the initial review of research grant applications. The NIH dual peer review system is mandated by statute in accordance with section 492 of the Public Health Service Act. The charge to this committee is to determine scientific and technical merit of the individual grants or contracts. These recommendations are forwarded to Federal officials who generally accept the committee's recommendations and favorable applications are then forwarded for the second level of review performed by Institute and Center (IC) National Advisory Councils or Boards. Only applications that are favorably recommended by both the initial peer review committee and the Advisory Council may be recommended for funding.

**Does the agency provide the committee with feedback regarding actions taken to implement recommendations or advice offered?**

Yes ☒ No ☐ Not Applicable ☐

**Agency Feedback Comments**

The agency provides written and oral reports.

**What other actions has the agency taken as a result of the committee's advice or recommendation?**

Checked if Applies

- Reorganized Priorities ☐
- Reallocated resources ☐
- Issued new regulation ☐
- Proposed legislation ☐
- Approved grants or other payments ☒
- Other ☐

### Action Comments

An action of “approved” or “recommended” for grants receiving initial peer review by this committee does not infer that the grant will be or has been funded. Research grant applications submitted to NIH must go through a two-step review process that includes the initial peer review for scientific and technical merit and a second step of review and approval by a National Advisory Council for program relevance. In addition, prior to an award or funding being made, NIH staff must conduct an administrative review for a number of other considerations. These include alignment with NIH’s funding principles, review of the project budget, assessment of the applicant’s management systems, determination of applicant eligibility, and compliance with public policy requirements. After all these steps have been completed, NIH officials make funding decisions on individual grant applications.

### Is the Committee engaged in the review of applications for grants?

Yes

- What is the estimated Number of grants reviewed for approval 37
- What is the estimated Number of grants recommended for approval 37
- What is the estimated Dollar Value of grants recommended for approval \$76,969,737

### Grant Review Comments

Total (direct plus indirect) requested budget for the first year in each of the 37 applications.

### How is access provided to the information for the Committee's documentation?

Checked if Applies

- Contact DFO ☒
- Online Agency Web Site ☒
- Online Committee Web Site ☒
- Online GSA FACA Web Site ☒
- Publications ☐
- Other ☐

**Access Comments**

IC Committee Management Officer 240-669-5201